



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing all organizations and parties to carry on the campaign for mediation and pacific settlement. This should be done on the initiative and under the unifying agency of the Berne Bureau. In short, the bureau is the natural and logical international center for the movement for peace.

(2) There should be bureaus for communication between the pacifists of the belligerent countries and their fellow-workers. Berne and The Hague have already become such centers, but others are needed.

(3) Interchange of reliable and non-partisan news. National passion is inflamed and hatred stirred up by the one-sided and fantastic reports that are being spread abroad. Perhaps there should be published a bulletin for the dissemination of accurate information.

(4) Shall there be a declaration by the pacifists concerning the violations of international law? Shall these be investigated by an impartial commission?

(5) Documents should be collected dealing with the history that preceded the outbreak of the war.

(6) A commission perhaps ought to be formed to prepare for the international treaty to be made after the restoration of peace.

In conclusion, Dr. Quidde says:

"It appears to me almost equally important that we should, through our meeting, make known to all the world our international solidarity, as one of the few international organizations which stand firm amid the general disintegration and which unite in a friendly manner the representatives of the 'hostile' peoples.

"Also in the interest of our own organization it is especially desirable that leading pacifists of the various countries, particularly of the countries at war, should come into personal relations with each other, and upon neutral ground, in the sphere of internationalism, temporarily break loose from the one-sided information and the nationalistic influences to which many even of our pacifists run the risk of yielding. We can remain international without being untrue to the duties which every man has to fulfill toward his own country, and we must so remain if we have ever been truly in earnest in our profession of pacifist ideals."

Dr. de Jong Van Beek En Donk states four reasons why he desires the calling of the Berne Bureau:

(1) It should lead in combining and giving utterance to the different ideas now finding expression in the neutral countries.

(2) It ought to form an international organization of pacifists, a separate organization, to include representatives of all sorts of bodies. In Holland, for example, the Dutch Peace Society has formed a "Dutch Council against War," consisting of representatives of all political organizations, labor parties, and the like.

(3) It could make use of the present time to study the great problems which will demand solution after the war closes; small committees could be named to study limitation of armaments, a federation of the nations, the abolition of secret diplomacy, etc.

(4) It could declare its continued belief in *internationalism*, and speak for all the pacifists of all the nations as with one voice.

The Dutch proposal for a world petition is explained—a petition which is to be prepared in each

country, signatures obtained, and to be presented at the time when the proffer of mediation is accepted. Also there has originated with them a plan for great public peace demonstrations in each country for the treaty of peace. He calls special attention to the memorial to President Wilson, prepared by representatives of the American Association for International Conciliation, the American Peace Society, the Church Peace Union, and other peace societies of America, asking for a *joint* offer of mediation by all the neutral nations, and for the co-operation of the *neutral* as well as the belligerent powers in the terms of peace and the regulation of international relations.

While the convocation of the International Peace Bureau at the present moment is impossible, it is opportune for the peace workers of all the countries to be considering these matters, so forcibly called to our attention by our European friends, and to plan for national unification and organization as preparatory to the international work of the near future.

Our Personal Appeal.

The American Peace Society is face to face with a remarkable situation. Having labored continuously for eighty-six years against the crime of war, it beholds eight of the nations committing just that crime wildly and on an unprecedented scale. Of course, the peace workers have been stunned. Indeed, at first thought it might seem as if the labors and the consecration of a century have been sadly wasted.

But, on the contrary, it begins to appear rather that the ancient teachings of our society are beginning to be understood in these days, and that to the satisfaction of many persons who heretofore have chosen to ignore or in some cases to despise those teachings. It is quite unnecessary in the United States to argue against war today. This was not true in June, but it is now. Events in Europe are teaching the lessons of Noah Worcester, William Ladd, Elihu Burritt, and Charles Sumner far more effectively even than did they. The tale is being told at last with an informing emphasis. A century of "pacifists" are being vindicated, horribly enough, but vindicated.

But are the lessons to strike home? Are the egregious errors of thinking responsible for this gigantic curse to be uprooted forever? Is the hideous institution of militarism to be continued after the terms of peace are made? Or shall an international machinery be devised as a rational substitute for war? Can war be forever abolished?

We have always believed, and still believe, that it can. The soldiers fighting today in the trenches, the statesmen, diplomats, and many militarists even, are urging that it can and should be. But if it is abolished, it will be because the great world conscience, aroused as it is, shall be organized for expression and action. These high aims cannot be left to themselves—they cannot be left to the governments alone.

The unusual situation, therefore, presents an unusual opportunity, especially for America. If only the principles urged for so long by this society can become active

convictions with sufficient numbers, and if these convictions can be organized and focused upon the problem, then the press, the pulpits, and the schools will heed; men and women of the market-place will lend their aid; legislators and ambassadors will listen and help. Out of such an educational movement, and only such, can the follies of war be removed and a rational substitute provided.

Every one who reads these words will probably know how limited are the resources of this society for the promotion of such a large propaganda; but he will also know, or can easily ascertain, that the society needs but one thing to make such a campaign still more conspicuously effective. That one thing is money.

It is something new for this society to appeal for large funds. We have become accustomed to doing with little. But the distressing world situation, bringing to our doors this remarkable opportunity, heartens us to appeal openly and candidly for funds—a large sum of money, one million dollars, two million dollars—more, if possible. The organization is at hand; it only needs extension. Our society's history, system, aims, and ideals are as an open book. Upon them the American Peace Society frankly bases its appeal. You would do away with war? That, certainly, is our specialty. Help us. The philanthropy of the world has never faced a greater opportunity than the opportunity rapidly developing before humanity today—the opportunity to end forever the monstrous curse of international war. Which of the two privileges below can we prevail upon you to accept? The need is real and immediate:

FORM OF GIFT.

I am enclosing \$..... as my contribution to the Special Fund proposed by the American Peace Society. It is my desire that the money be used as the society may best decide for the promotion of its efforts to do away with international war.

N. B.—For a time gifts of \$25.00 or over will entitle the donor to a *Life Membership* in the American Peace Society and to its monthly magazine, *THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I give and bequeath to the American Peace Society the sum of dollars, to be appropriated by the directors thereof in such manner as they deem most effective for the abolition of international war.

Can Permanent Peace Between Nations be Secured?

A PROPOSED DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

(This declaration has been presented to the executive committee of the American Peace Society by one of our most devoted and active friends. The committee desires to receive frank expressions either of approval or criticism of this statement.)

We hope that it will not be considered inappropriate if we undertake for the sympathizers with the cause of peace, so far as we may speak for them, to lay down some of the principles calculated, we believe, to insure firm and everlasting peace between nations. In so doing we feel called upon definitely to reject certain of the ideas which heretofore have controlled the international relations of States, because we recognize that the growth of intercourse between nations has rendered such theories in truth obsolete.

We deny, for example, the absolute right of any nation to determine its course of action irrespective of possible effects upon its neighbors, just as states deny such right to an individual person. We assume that a nation is a member of a common family or community, and that as such its sovereign rights, so called, must be limited by the corresponding rights of other nations. We conceive that this proposition denies to any nation the right to initiate war against another; that this be true whether there be claim of infraction of boundaries, oppression of those of common blood, affronts to honor, historical enmities, or whatever may be the real or fancied cause. From these considerations it follows that it would be as wrong internationally for a nation to attack another as it is nationally wrong for a private individual to declare blood feud against his neighbor. The restriction placed upon a nation entering into the society of nations must be that it thereby surrenders its right to be advocate, judge, and executioner of its own policies, irrespective of who may be injured directly or indirectly by such conduct. Does not the existing worldwide distress afford an absolute demonstration of the futility of any other conclusion?

We therefore declare that with the termination of the present conflict there should be an agreement between the nations of the earth which shall preclude any nation from determining alone the righteousness of its own cause as against the interests of another nation.

We recognize in the present conflict the absolute breakdown of the theory that the strength of a nation rests upon the perfection of its military system and the development of its enginery of war. We consider that current history demonstrates that one nation's determination to base its very existence on the ability to control by arms the will of other nations leads only to a similar determination on their part. The inevitable result is simply the ultimate injury or destruction of all. Militarism, in short, defeats the very ends for which it purports to exist.

We therefore further declare that the employment of armaments by a nation should not extend beyond the preservation of internal order, and that they should never be used for foreign aggression. When the fires of the present conflict are extinguished, the nations must submit at once to some plan of co-operative, collective, and radical reduction of armaments. To this plan the United States, of course, must be a party. Hence we are resolutely opposed at this time to any increase of the military or naval strength on the part of our own government, for we dare hope that in this respect, as already with regard to democratic government, the United States shall remain the leader of the world.

We recognize that the Hague Conferences, however beneficial they may have been in giving a partial sanction to the purposes of arbitration between nations, have absolutely failed in their treatment of the subject of war. This, we regretfully say, is because they have not adequately considered the views we have hereinbefore expressed, because they have regarded war between nations as the inevitable if not the legitimate expression of the assumed national will of disputants, and because they have succeeded, and that most feebly, simply in cloaking some of the savagery and brutality of international conflict.

We declare that the time is now come when the ax should be laid to the root; that hereafter no "Confer-